

PATRICIA L. GLASER - State Bar No. 55668
pglaser@glaserweil.com
ERICA J. VAN LOON - State Bar No. 227712
evanloon@glaserweil.com
REX HWANG - State Bar No. 221079
rhwang@glaserweil.com
NICHOLAS E. HUSKINS - State Bar No. 299133
nhuskins@glaserweil.com
GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD
AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP
10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 553-3000
Facsimile: (310) 556-2920

Attorneys for Defendants

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT ALEXANDER KASEBERG,

Plaintiff,

v.

CONACO, LLC; TURNER
BROADCASTING SYSTEM; TIME
WARNER, INC.; CONAN O'BRIEN;
JEFF ROSS; MIKE SWEENEY; DOES
1-50, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 15-CV-01637-JLS-DHB

Hon. Janis L. Sammartino

**JOINT MOTION TO AMEND THE
SCHEDULING ORDER TO
FURTHER EXTEND PRETRIAL
DEADLINES**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 16.1.b, Defendants Conaco, LLC, Turner Broadcasting System, Inc., Time Warner Inc., Conan O'Brien, Jeff Ross, and Mike Sweeney (collectively, "Defendants"), and Plaintiff Robert Alexander Kaseberg ("Plaintiff") (collectively, the "Parties"), by and through their counsel of record, hereby stipulate, agree, and jointly move the Court to amend its Scheduling Order Regulating Discovery and Other Pre-Trial Proceedings (the "Scheduling Order") (ECF No. 29), as modified by the Court's February 15, 2017 Order (ECF No. 92), to extend pre-trial deadlines, as requested herein.

I. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

On February 23, 2016, this Court issued the Scheduling Order. ECF No. 29. At the request of the Parties, this Court modified the Scheduling Order to extend the deadline to file pretrial motions to February 6, 2017. ECF No. 64. On February 3, 2017, Defendants filed their Motion For Summary Judgment And/Or Partial Summary Judgment Or, In The Alternative, Summary Adjudication (the "Summary Judgment Motion"). ECF No. 70. On February 15, 2017, the Court granted the Parties' stipulation to further modify the Scheduling Order to allow the parties to complete their briefing and receive a ruling on the Summary Judgment Motion before commencing with remaining pretrial obligations. ECF No. 92.

The Court heard arguments on Defendants' Summary Judgment Motion on April 6, 2017. *Id.* Prior to hearing arguments, the Court read a tentative ruling, which stated:

"The court is tentatively inclined...to grant Defendants' motion for summary judgment regarding the UAB Joke, the Delta Joke, and the Tom Brady Joke; deny Defendants' motion for summary judgment regarding the Washington Monument Joke and the Jenner Joke; grant Defendants' motion for summary adjudication that the jokes are only entitled to thin protection; and, finally, deny Defendants' motion for summary adjudication regarding willfulness." Declaration of Nicholas Huskins In Support of the Parties' Joint Motion to Further Extend Pretrial Deadlines, Ex. 1 (Hearing Tr. at 12:8-15).

In addition, the Court requested additional briefing on issues relating to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c). ECF No. 122. The Parties submitted their supplemental briefing on April 21, 2017. ECF Nos. 124 - 127.

In light of Defendants' pending Summary Judgment Motion, the Court's tentative ruling, and Plaintiff's counsel's unavailability from June 18-30, 2017 the Parties seek to extend the remaining pretrial deadlines as follows:

<u>Matter</u>	<u>Current Deadline</u>	<u>Proposed Deadline</u>
Memoranda of Contentions of Fact and Law, and other action required by Local Rule 16.1(f)(2). ECF No. 29, ¶ 10.	May 11, 2017	July 13, 2017
Pre-trial disclosure requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3). ECF No. 29, ¶ 11.	May 11, 2017	July 13, 2017
Conference of counsel and action required by Local Rule 16.1(f)(4). ECF No. 29, ¶ 12.	May 18, 2017	July 20, 2017
Plaintiff's proposed pretrial order due to Defendants. ECF No. 29, ¶ 13.	May 25, 2017	July 27, 2017
Proposed Pretrial Conference Order and any objections to any other parties' Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3) Pretrial Disclosures. ECF No. 29, ¶ 14.	June 1, 2017	August 3, 2017
Final Pretrial Conference before the Honorable Janis L. Sammartino. ECF No. 29, ¶ 15.	June 8, 2017	August 10, 2017

1 **II. STATEMENT OF GOOD CAUSE**

2 Because the Defendants' Summary Judgment Motion remains pending before
3 the Court, the same justifications raised in the Parties' previous stipulation concerning
4 judicial economy and efficiency still apply. Indeed, the Parties wish to avoid
5 burdening the Court and incurring unnecessary expenses preparing pretrial
6 disclosures and filings on issues that may be settled and/or disposed of before trial.

7 If the final order is in line with the tentative as stated above, it will streamline
8 the Parties' pretrial preparation. For example, witness testimony, evidence and trial
9 exhibits, and arguments or contentions offered in pretrial filings regarding any jokes
10 dismissed on summary judgment may be limited or unnecessary. Similarly,
11 competing jury instructions and pretrial filings disputing whether "substantial
12 similarity" or "virtual identity" is the applicable standard of comparison in a
13 copyright infringement analysis may be avoided.

14 The Parties recognize that the Court's tentative ruling is not a final ruling. The
15 Parties further recognize that the supplemental briefing submitted by the Parties may
16 alter these issues, particularly as to the Tom Brady and UAB Jokes. Nevertheless, the
17 ruling is likely to eliminate, narrow, and/or clarify what issues are left for trial. Such
18 guidance will facilitate a more focused and effective pre-trial preparation, whether or
19 not the ruling follows the tentative. This will necessarily allow for a more efficient
20 expenditure of both judicial and client resources. As deadlines for potentially-
21 impacted pretrial obligations begin May 11, 2017, an extension is justified to allow
22 the Court time to issue its order, and allow the Parties time to consider the impact of
23 the order before proceeding with the remaining pretrial obligations.

24 Finally, the Parties agree the proposed amendment to the Scheduling Order does
25 not present any prejudice. Extending the aforementioned deadlines equally impacts
26 Plaintiff and Defendants, as both must comply with the remaining pre-trial obligations,
27 and the order will impact the Parties' preparation equally. As no trial date has been set,
28 an extension of pre-trial deadlines will not result in unfair delay to any party.

The Parties submit that they have been reasonably diligent in adhering to current deadlines, and that the proposed extension is requested purely to facilitate an efficient preparation of pretrial disclosures and filings. As this motion is brought in good faith and in the interest of efficiency for the Court, the Parties, and counsel, and not for delay or any improper purpose, good cause exists to further extend the remaining pretrial deadlines, as requested herein.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Parties respectfully request that this Court, for good cause, enter an order further extending the pretrial deadlines as requested herein, or a corresponding adjustment of all remaining pretrial deadlines following a final order on Defendants' Summary Judgment Motion.

DATED: May 6, 2017

GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD
AVCHEN & SHAPIRO LLP

By: /s/ Erica J. Van Loon
PATRICIA L. GLASER
ERICA J. VAN LOON
REX HWANG
NICHOLAS E. HUSKINS
Attorneys for Defendants

DATED: May 6, 2017

By: /s/ Jayson M. Lorenzo
JAYSON M. LORENZO
Attorney for Plaintiff

Glaser Weil

SIGNATURE ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Section 2(f)(4) of the Electronic Case Filing Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual for the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, the undersigned confirms that all other signatories listed, and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized the filing.

/s/ Erica J. Van Loon
ERICA J. VAN LOON

GlaserWeil